

Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached as an appendix to this paper are replacement formal drawing sheets showing FIGS. 1-11.

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the office action dated May 8, 2008.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as being informal, and required the filing of formal drawings, which are attached as an appendix to this paper. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the Abstract as both including the Title of the Invention and as being too short. The applicant has amended the Abstract to remove the reference to the Title of the Invention and to be descriptive of particular disclosures contained in the present application. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

The Examiner objected to the Title of the application as not being descriptive. The applicant has amended the Title to broadly describe the subject matter claimed in the present application. The applicant notes that the amended title includes material suggested by the Examiner, except that the Examiner also suggested including the phrase "Containing Both Search and Navigation Attributes" in the Title. The applicant has not included this phrase because not all of the claimed subject matter requires these attributes.

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims 15-19, 22, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-4, 7, and 9 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/867,981. The applicant has amended independent claim 15 so that it no longer duplicates claim 1 of applicant's co-pending application. Claims 16-19 depend from claim 15. The applicant has canceled claims 22 and 28. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 9-22 and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Each of independent claims 9 and 15 have been amended to recite the limitation of "each of said single segment information description scheme and said segment group information description scheme are

interactively accessible to a user through said audiovisual device." Claims 10-14 and 16-20 each respectively depend from one of claims 9 and 15, Claims 25 and 26 have each been amended to recite the limitation of "where the hierarchical representation is viewable by a viewer through an audiovisual device." Claims 21, 22 and 27-30 have been canceled. The applicant therefore requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-22 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Qian et al., "Description Schemes for Consumer Video Applications," ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG11 - MPEG-7 Proposal, February 1999 (hereinafter Qian). The Examiner rejected the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Qian in view of Yeo et al., "Retrieving and Visualizing Video" COMMUNICATIONS OF THE ACM, December 1997.

Claims 21, 22, and 27-30 have been canceled. Independent claim 2, as amended, recites the limitation of "wherein said searching attributes and navigation attributes are within a single description scheme that links segments selectable using said navigation attributes with content searchable with said searching attributes." As noted by the Examiner. Qian merely discloses searching attributes with respect to a program description scheme, and navigation attributes with respect to a user description scheme, where these two description schemes are separate. Qian fails to disclose that these attributes are part of a "single description scheme" that "links segments selectable using said navigation attributes with content searchable with said searching attributes." Therefore, claim 2, as well as its dependent claims 3-8 each patentably distinguish over Qian.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites the limitation of "a segment group information description scheme where said segment group information description scheme is capable of identifying either selective one of both: (i) at least one single segment information description scheme; and (ii) at least one other segment group information description scheme but is constrained against identifying both (iii) at least one single segment information description scheme; and (iv) at least one other segment group information description scheme." This limitation is not disclosed by Qian, which


includes no such constraint; though the description scheme of Qian may often, through chance, identify only one of the claimed "at least one single segment information description scheme" and "at least one other segment group information description scheme," nothing disclosed by Qian indicates or suggests that a description scheme be constrained to ensure this structure. Therefore, claim 9, as well as its dependent claims 10-14 each patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Each of independent claims 15 and 23-26 have been amended to include limitations that distinguish over Qian and the combination of Qian and Yeo for the same reasons as does independent claim 9. Claims 16-20 each respectively depend from independent claim 15, and are therefore also distinguished over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-20 and 23-26.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 30, 2008



Kevin L. Russell
Reg. No. 38,292
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631

APPENDIX

Attached are replacement drawing sheets (FIGS. 1-11).